

This is a repository copy of *Clear theories are needed to interpret differences : Perspectives on the bilingual advantage debate*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/173602/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

De Bruin, Angela Maria Theresia, Dick, Anthony Steven and Carreiras, Manuel (2021) Clear theories are needed to interpret differences : Perspectives on the bilingual advantage debate. *Neurobiology of Language*. pp. 433-451. ISSN 2641-4368

https://doi.org/10.1162/nol_a_00038

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Clear theories are needed to interpret differences: Perspectives on the bilingual advantage debate

Short Title: Perspectives on the bilingual advantage debate

Angela de Bruin^{1,2}, Anthony Steven Dick³, & Manuel Carreiras^{2,4,5}

¹ Department of Psychology, University of York, York, United Kingdom

² Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language (BCBL), Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

³ Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, FL, United States

⁴ University of the Basque Country, Bilbao, Spain

⁵ Ikerbasque, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

Corresponding author:

Manuel Carreiras

Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language (BCBL)

Paseo Mikeletegi 69, 2nd floor; 20009 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

m.carreiras@bcbl.eu

Telephone: +34943309300

Authors report no conflict of interest

Funding sources

The first author received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number 743691. The last author received funding from the Basque Government (BERC 2018–2021), the Agencia Estatal de Investigación: the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres/Units of Excellence (SEV - 2015 - 490) and grant (grant RTI2018-093547-B-I00).



Clear theories are needed to interpret differences: Perspectives on the bilingual advantage debate

Angela de Bruin^{1,2}, Anthony Steven Dick³, & Manuel Carreiras^{2,4, 5}

¹ Department of Psychology, University of York, York, United Kingdom

² Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language (BCBL), Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

³ Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, FL, United States

⁴ University of the Basque Country, Bilbao, Spain

⁵ Ikerbasque, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

Corresponding author:

Manuel Carreiras

Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language (BCBL)

Paseo Mikeletegi 69, 2nd floor; 20009 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

m.carreiras@bcbl.eu

Telephone: +34943309300

Abstract

The heated debate regarding bilingual cognitive advantages remains ongoing. While there are many studies supporting positive cognitive effects of bilingualism, recent meta-analyses have concluded that there is no consistent evidence for a 'bilingual advantage'. In this paper we focus on several theoretical concerns. First, we discuss changes in theoretical frameworks, which have led to the development of insufficiently clear theories and hypotheses that are difficult to falsify. Next, we discuss the development of looking at bilingual experiences and the need to better understand *language* control. Last, we argue that the move from behavioural studies to a focus on brain plasticity is not going to solve the debate on cognitive effects, especially not when brain changes are interpreted in the absence of behavioural differences. Clearer theories on both behavioural and neural effects of bilingualism are needed. However, to achieve this, a solid understanding of both bilingualism and executive functions is needed first.

Abstract: 151 words

Manuscript: 7806 words

1. Introduction

Speaking more than one language is advantageous in this multilingual and highly interconnected world. Multilinguals can communicate directly with speakers of other languages and have access to other cultures, among other benefits. Apart from these communication advantages, bilingualism has been claimed to improve other cognitive domains, in particular executive functioning (e.g., Bialystok, Craik, Klein, & Viswanathan, 2004). The underlying idea is that executive functions would be used and developed more strongly in bilinguals than in monolinguals. Bilinguals are said to acquire better inhibitory control and monitoring skills than monolinguals because they need to inhibit the irrelevant language, monitor the surroundings, and resolve conflicting information (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2004). In addition, bilinguals who frequently switch between languages in daily life may have better task-switching skills (e.g., Prior & Gollan, 2011). Furthermore, cognitive benefits of bilingualism have been linked to delays in the onset of diseases such as dementia and to less decline associated with healthy ageing, with possible implications for public health (Bialystok, Abutalebi, Bak, Burke, & Kroll, 2016; Perani et al., 2017). This attractive idea termed “bilingual advantage” (e.g., Kroll & Bialystok, 2013) has been quickly adopted by the mass media publishing headlines and statements such as: “*Bilingual adults have sharper brains*” (Huffington Post, 2013); “*Being bilingual really does boost brain power*” (Dailymail.com, 2015).

Despite the popularity of this topic in the media and the emphasis on societal benefits, the evidence for enhanced cognitive functioning in bilinguals is also widely questioned. In this paper, we will start with a brief overview of the evidence for a

'bilingual advantage'¹. We will focus on bilingualism and cognition in healthy participants. This has been the focus of many recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses (e.g., Antoniou, 2019; Bialystok, 2017; Donnelly, Brooks, & Homer, 2019; Hilchey, Saint-Aubin, & Klein, 2015; Lehtonen et al., 2018; Paap, 2019). Critically, we will focus on several theoretical issues that are important to consider to move the debate forward. First, we discuss the continuous changes in theoretical frameworks and issues when testing these frameworks. Next, we discuss how differences in executive functioning have been associated with individual differences between bilinguals. Although this is a promising way forward, we argue that this can only be examined with a solid understanding of individual differences in *language* control. Third, recent years have seen an increase in neuroimaging studies comparing bilinguals and monolinguals on executive control tasks. We argue that, while these neuroimaging studies are interesting in their own respect, they cannot solve the 'bilingual advantage debate' without behavioural evidence and without clear predictions about the specific brain regions and brain circuits that should reveal bilingual-monolingual differences in executive control. For this field to progress, more specific theories and hypotheses need to be formed regarding the behavioural and neural relationship between bilingualism and executive control. We will posit that two developments are needed to achieve this. First, to develop theories, a better understanding of bilingualism and bilingual *language* control is needed. Second, multi-lab studies with clear preregistered hypotheses are needed to reliably interpret the data across different types of bilinguals.

¹ Note that we will be using the term 'bilingual advantage' to refer to *cognitive* advantages.

2. Behavioural comparisons between bilinguals and monolinguals

Several early studies comparing bilinguals and monolinguals showed enhanced performance in bilinguals on various tasks assumed to measure executive functioning (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2004; Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2008; Bialystok & Martin, 2004; Costa, Hernández, Costa-Faidella, & Sebastián-Gallés, 2009; Costa, Hernández, & Sebastián-Gallés, 2008). In contrast, there are also many studies reporting no differences between bilinguals and monolinguals on executive control tasks (e.g., Antón et al., 2014, 2016; Duñabeitia et al., 2014; Gathercole et al., 2014; Paap & Greenberg, 2013), especially in studies using larger sample sizes (e.g., Antón, Carreiras, & Duñabeitia, 2019; Dick et al., 2019; Duñabeitia et al., 2014; Nichols et al., 2020; Paap & Greenberg, 2013).

A more comprehensive overview of the literature on this topic has been provided in recent systematic reviews (e.g., Antoniou, 2019; Bialystok, 2017; Van den Noort, Struys, & Bosch, 2019) and meta-analyses (e.g., Donnelly et al., 2019; Grundy, 2020; Gunnerud et al., 2020; Lehtonen et al., 2018; Paap, 2019). While there is both evidence for and against a bilingual cognitive advantage, recent meta-analyses taking into account publication bias (e.g., Lehtonen et al., 2018) conclude that there is no strong or consistent evidence for enhanced executive functioning in bilinguals. Similar conclusions were reached in a meta-analysis on children (Gunnerud et al., 2020), although a small but significant effect on switching was found. These reviews and meta-analyses also attempted to go beyond a ‘yes/no’ answer, acknowledging that studies differ in, amongst others, the type of bilinguals tested and the type of executive control tasks used. These are all variables that can potentially modulate performance of both bilinguals and monolinguals on executive control tasks. Currently, however, there is no

consistent evidence *across studies* for a modulating role of e.g., specific bilingual experiences or the type of task used (Lehtonen et al., 2018).

In addition, it is frequently claimed that differences may not be captured in young adults because they perform at ceiling, but that cognitive development and decline should allow for effects of bilingualism to occur in children and older adults (e.g., Kroll & Bialystok, 2013; Grundy, 2020). Meta-analyses, however, have found comparable (null) results in different age groups (e.g., younger and older adults, Lehtonen et al., 2018; children and young adults, Donnelly et al., 2019), suggesting that evidence for a bilingual advantage is not only limited in young adults, but also in children and (healthy) older adults. Interestingly, it had also been proposed that the effects of bilingualism on attentional processes could be observed already during infants' first year of life (Kovács & Mehler, 2009; Comishen, Bialystok, & Adler, 2019). However, data from a recent Registered Report (Kalashnikova, Pejovic & Carreiras, 2020) show that bilingual and monolingual infants' performance did not differ in attentional control.

In sum, systematic reviews and meta-analyses thus suggest that a cognitive 'bilingual advantage' is at best small and may only exist in very specific circumstances or for specific types of bilinguals. We will discuss three recent developments that have been proposed as future avenues for research on bilingualism and executive control. First, we will consider (changes) in theoretical frameworks. Second, we will discuss the role of individual bilingual experiences. Third, we will review recent neuroimaging research used to examine the potential relationship between bilingualism and executive control.

3. Theoretical framework and data interpretation

Much past and recent work on bilingual-monolingual differences focuses on inhibition costs. Studies looking at inhibitory control typically include conditions with incongruent trials (presenting information that interferes with the expected response) and congruent trials (presenting information that is compatible with the expected response). Participants usually need more time to respond to incongruent than congruent conditions, a difference that is taken to reflect an inhibition cost. Some studies observe bilingual-monolingual differences on these inhibition costs (e.g., Pelham & Abrams, 2014) while others do not (e.g., Paap & Greenberg, 2013). Others find that within the study, effects may be task dependent (e.g., Woumans, Ceuleers, Van der Linden, Szmalec, & Duyck, 2015, showed a larger monolingual *inhibition cost* on one task but longer monolingual *overall RTs* on another task). The initial framework regarding bilingualism and executive control focused on inhibition. According to the initial hypothesis focusing on inhibition, a bilingual constantly needs to inhibit one of their languages in daily life, which should lead to non-verbal inhibitory control advantages (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2004). Theories focusing on inhibition would posit that bilingual-monolingual differences should occur on measures of inhibition costs, such as the difference between incongruent and congruent trials described above. This offers a testable hypothesis.

One major challenge when looking at inhibition costs, however, is that tasks reporting these costs often show low correlations (cf. Paap & Greenberg, 2013; Rouder, Kumar, & Haaf, 2019). The idea that inhibition is a unitary construct has therefore been criticised (Rey-Mermet, Gade, & Oberauer, 2018), raising the point that tasks might not measure the underlying construct of inhibition but rather the “highly task-specific ability to resolve the interference arising in that task”. (p. 515). Following this account,

it could be argued that the mixed results in the literature on bilingualism might reflect task-dependent effects, with bilinguals having an advantage on a certain type of task-specific interference resolution. If this is true, certain tasks should stand out (e.g., a Simon task might be more likely to reveal a bilingual-monolingual difference than e.g., a flanker task). However, current comparisons across studies (e.g., Lehtonen et al., 2018) do not show consistent evidence for such difference between “inhibition tasks”. Furthermore, based on our current understanding of these different tasks, it is unclear exactly which types of task-specific interference resolution would be most likely to be affected by bilingualism (cf. e.g., Blumenfeld & Marian, 2014, and Paap, Anders-Jefferson, Mikulinsky, Masuda, & Mason, 2019). To be able to formulate any theories or hypotheses that take into consideration task-specific types of inhibition/interference resolution, we need a much better understanding of what these different tasks actually measure.

A second explanation of low correlations between inhibition tasks is that they measure the same underlying construct but that task outcomes are influenced by task-specific features that add noise. This issue could, at least to some extent, be overcome through analyses using latent variables (cf. Friedman, 2016; Rouder et al., 2019). If there is an underlying construct, this allows researchers to examine whether there is a bilingual-monolingual difference on *that construct* as measured through multiple tasks rather than on one specific task that might be influenced by task-specific features. Similar approaches can be used for other constructs of interest that have been tested in relation to bilingual-monolingual differences (e.g., task switching, Prior & Gollan, 2011; working memory, e.g., Engel de Abreu, 2011).

While the initial research (and much of the recent research) focuses on specific aspects of executive function, such as inhibition or shifting, the hypotheses regarding

bilingualism and executive control are undergoing constant changes. This is driven by studies finding group differences on overall RTs in conflict tasks (e.g., Emmorey, Luk, Pyers, & Bialystok, 2008), without a difference in inhibition costs (but cf. Bialystok et al., 2004). New theories were therefore proposed that focused on an advantage in conflict monitoring rather than inhibition, possibly related to a bilingual's need to monitor the circumstances to select the current target language (e.g., Costa et al., 2009). These theories can offer testable hypotheses if they include a baseline condition. For instance, accounts on conflict monitoring posit that a bilingual advantage should only occur in conditions involving both conflict and non-conflict trials (i.e., requiring more conflict monitoring; cf. Costa et al., 2009). Such advantage would not be expected in conditions that do not require conflict monitoring. However, studies finding overall RT differences between bilinguals and monolinguals on conflict tasks do not always include a baseline condition. Without such baseline condition, it is difficult to interpret whether RT differences are really due to conflict monitoring. For example, it might be that one group is faster *in general*. Adding a baseline task without conflict could show whether bilingual-monolingual RT differences are specific to conflict monitoring (RT differences in the conflict but not in the baseline task) or related to differences in general processing speed (RT differences in all tasks, even those without conflict). We therefore recommend the inclusion of simple baseline conditions without conflict. For example, a flanker task could include a baseline condition in which participants simply respond to one arrow presented in the centre of the screen. RTs (and potential group differences) in this baseline task can then be compared to the flanker task requiring conflict monitoring through presentation of congruent and incongruent (conflict) trials.

In recent years, a more holistic approach has been advocated (e.g., Kroll & Bialystok, 2013) that focuses on executive functions as a whole rather than specific

subcomponents such as inhibition or switching. Different terms have been used, including enhanced 'cognitive flexibility' (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013) and 'executive attention' (Bialystok, 2017). This executive attention system is described as a continuous, central, domain-general system in which memory and attention interact to allow for complex cognition (Bialystok, 2017). The danger with some newer frameworks, however, is that they become unprofitably vague. That is, executive attention is seen as a continuous mechanism that is involved in all sorts of complex cognition. Differences in executive attention can occur on a wide range of tasks and measures without a clear theory or hypotheses as to *when* and *where* these effects should be observed (cf. Hartsuiker, 2015; Laine & Lehtonen, 2018).

This poses problems for studies that test bilinguals and monolinguals on different tasks, that look at conflict costs and overall RTs, and that measure reaction times and accuracy, and that then find a bilingual-monolingual difference on one measure only. This type of research should either be hypothesis driven or should avoid drawing conclusions about individual tasks. When there is a clear theory and hypothesis, task-specific patterns can be interpreted. For example, a researcher might be interested in assessing the role of verbal versus non-verbal stimuli based on the hypothesis that bilinguals experience language interference in tasks using verbal materials. A bilingual disadvantage on the verbal but not on the non-verbal task could then be explained following their hypothesis. When such theory or hypothesis is not present (e.g., when a Simon and flanker task are included, without a clear hypothesis about potential task differences), the danger is that *any* difference on *any* task would be interpreted as evidence for a “bilingual advantage”, with a focus on the study’s positive findings. Without a clear theory or hypothesis about what different tasks/measures indicate, how they differ or compare, and how they might show different patterns in

bilinguals and monolinguals, we should be careful that we do not focus too much on or overinterpret the measure that shows a positive finding. In the absence of clear hypotheses about task-specific effects, latent-variable analyses (cf. Friedman, 2016; Rouder et al., 2019) might be preferable. This avoids having to generate post-hoc explanations for task differences that might be the result of noise added by task-specific features.

4. Individual differences between bilinguals

In addition to tasks potentially influencing bilingual-monolingual differences, the type of bilinguals tested might play an important role. This potential influence of individual differences in bilingualism has been the focus of recent research. One advantage of this approach is the move away from presenting bilinguals and monolinguals as homogenous groups that are the same across populations and studies. Comparing a group of bilinguals to a group of monolinguals inevitably requires the researchers to define where one group ends and the other starts. While the definition of a monolingual might seem straightforward (“e.g., a person who can only speak one language”), this is often not as easy as it seems. “Monolinguals” sometimes include participants who have learnt and/or have some proficiency in another language (e.g., Paap & Greenberg, 2013). Furthermore, dialect users are often classified as monolinguals (cf. Kirk, Kempe, Scott-Brown, Philipp, & Declerck, 2018) and monolinguals living in a linguistically diverse environment might differ from those living in more monolingual environments (cf. Bice & Kroll, 2019). Therefore, it might not (always) be possible to make a clear categorical distinction between bilinguals and monolinguals. Furthermore, a comparison between one group of bilinguals and one group of monolinguals creates the suggestion that there are no individual differences within those groups. Within

bilinguals there are many individual differences (e.g., proficiency, age of acquisition, use, switching) and one's personal language experiences have been argued to influence language control and consequently executive functions. These individual differences can and need to be studied in relation to executive functions. This can be done by comparing well-defined groups of bilinguals (e.g., a group of bilinguals with a high proficiency level in both languages versus a group with a lower proficiency in their second language) and/or by treating bilingualism and bilingual experiences (e.g., proficiency) as a continuum. Several language experiences have been studied in relation to executive function, including age of acquisition (e.g., Luk et al., 2011); proficiency (e.g., Singh & Mishra, 2013); and modality (e.g., Emmorey et al., 2008). Recent frameworks focus on language use and switching (cf. Blanco-Elorrieta & Pylkkänen, 2018). Green and Abutalebi's Adaptive Control Hypothesis (2013) focuses on how a bilingual's language use can shape both language control and executive functions, depending on the language environment they find themselves in. For example, a bilingual who spends much time in more controlled dual-language environments that require them to switch languages in response to cues (e.g., interlocutors) might have more need for and develop interference suppression and goal maintenance more strongly than a bilingual who can freely switch with other bilinguals who speak the same languages. The research comparing different types of language switchers has shown mixed effects (e.g., Paap et al., 2014; Prior & Gollan, 2011, Verreyt, Woumans, Vandelandotte, Szmalec, & Duyck, 2016). To some extent mixed results might be due to the way language switching is measured and the type of switchers that are compared. For example, looking at frequency of switching might not consider that bilinguals who switch frequently might do so very differently. Thus, in addition to considering switch

frequently, type of switching (e.g., in response to external cues versus free dense code switching) needs to be considered (Green & Abutalebi, 2013).

Crucially, though, the hypothesis that certain types of bilinguals might be more likely to show cognitive advantages than others is based on language control depending on bilingual experiences. The Adaptive Control Hypothesis (Green & Abutalebi, 2013) describes how these experiences might moderate both language control and executive control, but there is very little empirical work to assess influences on language control. Influences on executive control *depend* on understanding language control. To understand “transfer of training” (from language to executive control) we first need to understand the “training” itself (i.e., language control). To facilitate this, we need more detailed descriptions and measures of bilingual participants to examine the influence of bilingual experiences within and across studies (cf. de Bruin, 2019; Surrain & Luk, 2019). Recent work has started to suggest that language control might be shaped by the interactional context (e.g., Blanco-Elorrieta & Pylkkänen, 2017; de Bruin, Samuel, & Duñabeitia, 2018). There is also some emerging work comparing different types of bilinguals on e.g., the processing of code switches (e.g., Beatty-Martinez & Dussias, 2017). However, far more research is needed to understand how language experiences can shape language control before we can form more exact theories about which language experiences might shape (components of) executive control.

5. Brain plasticity

In addition to behavioural studies, there is now an increasing number of studies focusing on brain differences between bilinguals and monolinguals (cf. Bialystok, 2017; Vinerte & Sabourin, 2019; Grundy, Anderson, & Bialystok, 2017). Other studies have shown that similar brain regions might be involved in language control and

inhibitory control (cf. Abutalebi & Green, 2007) or in language and task switching (De Baene, Duyck, Brass, & Carreiras, 2015), which has been taken to suggest a close relationship between language and executive control. However, while many brain differences have been observed between bilinguals and monolinguals, there is currently no consistent evidence that specific control-related regions show bilingual-monolingual differences *across studies* (see García-Pentón, Fernandez Garcia, Costello, Duñabeitia, & Carreiras, 2016). We do not aim to provide an exhaustive review of the neuroimaging literature here. What we do review is designed to show that the same issues described above for behavioural research also apply to neuroimaging studies. In addition, we will highlight additional challenges that need to be addressed to be able to interpret neuroimaging studies. We will first analyse recent work assessing EEG, followed by structural MRI and functional MRI (fMRI) research on bilingualism and executive functions.

5.1. Electrophysiological evidence

EEG (Electroencephalography) provides a rich and complex brain measure to investigate the potential influence of bilingualism on other cognitive processes such as executive control. The ERPs (Event Related Potentials) that result from time locking the EEG signal to a particular event offer latency, amplitude, polarity and topography as potential variables. Interestingly, some of these variables, like latency, are appropriate to capture early cognitive effects and the time course of different processes given its high temporal resolution. Nonetheless, differences between monolinguals and bilinguals in ERP amplitudes in the several different components (e.g., N200, P300, N400, ERN, etc.) allow different interpretations depending on whether an amplitude increase or decrease is associated with more efficient cognitive processes. At this point,

ERP evidence for or against cognitive processing benefits for bilinguals versus monolinguals is limited and mixed (see Cespón & Carreiras, 2020).

As an overall strategy, Cespón and Carreiras (2020) reviewed the effects of tasks used to measure executive functions (e.g., Simon, flanker, Stroop tasks, etc) on the latency and amplitude of different ERP components (N200, P300, N400/N450, ERN). This allowed to establish hypotheses about whether an increase or decrease in amplitude was related with more or less efficient cognitive processes independently of bilingualism. Taking this knowledge into account they hypothesized how bilingualism is expected to modulate effects (e.g., latency, amplitude, etc.) of a particular component if a bilingual advantage were present. Based on this review per ERP component, they offer two main recommendations for the way differences in latency and amplitude (e.g., larger or smaller amplitude) should be interpreted when comparing bilinguals and monolinguals on these tasks. First, only specific differences in ERP latency and/or amplitude can be used to support claims regarding enhanced executive-control efficiency in bilinguals. Cespón and Carreiras (2020) reviewed literature on executive control assessing different ERP components and formulated hypotheses for bilingual-monolingual differences and interpretations depending on the direction of a difference (i.e., how bilingualism will modulate the established latency/amplitude effects and the corresponding interpretation). These hypotheses can guide new ERP research on bilingualism and executive control, allowing researchers to establish a priori hypotheses based on previous work linking specific changes in ERPs to more or less efficient cognitive processes.

Second, their review recommends researchers to carry out correlational analyses of ERP amplitude with behavioural performance. This is important to establish whether potential ERP differences form a direct reflection of bilingual

advantages/disadvantages. When there is a correlation between the behavioural difference and the ERP difference (e.g., a smaller behavioural cost in combination with a decreased amplitude for bilinguals), this supports the interpretation that there is an advantage for bilinguals on this task. When such correlation is not observed (or when there is an ERP difference without a behavioural difference), it suggests that bilinguals and monolinguals might differ in the way they process information but without a directly associated bilingual *advantage*.

5.2. Magnetic Resonance Imaging evidence

Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and structural MRI (including diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) measures and morphologic measures recovered from T1- and T2-weighted MRI scans), as well as related functional imaging methods such as functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS) and magnetoencephalography (MEG), have been extremely useful for understanding brain plasticity and development, and have been informative for mapping the functional specialization of different brain regions. Several of these methods have also been used to examine brain differences in structure or function that result from bilingual experience as it relates to differences in brain networks associated with executive function (see Garcia-Penton et al., 2016; Pliatsikas & Luk, 2016; Bialystok et al., 2012; Costa & Sebastián-Gallés, 2014; Grundy et al., 2017 for reviews). Rather than giving a review of the (f)MRI literature, we will discuss the key issues affecting (f)MRI research on bilingualism and executive function.

5.2.1. Theoretical framework

Most of the MRI studies on bilingual-monolingual differences or differences between bilinguals in executive function have framed their investigations within the context of cognitive and neural models such as the Inhibitory Control model (Green, 1998), and more recent modifications formulated in the Adaptive Control Hypothesis (Green and Abutalebi, 2013), or the bilingual anterior-to-posterior and subcortical shift (BAPSS) model (Grundy et al., 2017). Theoretical models are critically important for prediction and interpretation of activation differences across groups of bilinguals and monolinguals. This is because neurobiological models of language and executive function in monolingual individuals are themselves complicated, and there is debate within each subfield about which grey matter regions and white matter tracts are critical to networks underpinning each process. In the field of language neurobiology, for example, neural networks for speech production and speech perception are only partially overlapping, and the issue gets more complicated at higher levels of language processing. Thus, at the sentential and discourse levels, much more of the brain, on both hemispheres, is recruited, especially in situations where syntactic and semantic constructions are more complex, and in cases where pragmatics come into play (Hagoort, 2019). When these latter linguistic processes are brought to bear, it is reasonable to argue that higher-level control processes might be recruited to navigate the additional semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic challenges of communicating in more than one language. Indeed, such demands may not be universal, but may emerge only in specific contexts or situations—i.e., any advantages emerge not from being bilingual, but from the ways in which languages need to be controlled in situational contexts (e.g., Blanco-Elorrieta & Pylkkänen, 2018). The question at the neurobiological level, though, is what this might look like

in terms of changes in regional activity and network dynamics. Thus, some sort of framing model is needed to interpret any potential differences.

The Adaptive Control hypothesis is designed to address these issues, as its central goal is to “identify a set of language control processes that support conversation in different interactional contexts, articulate the relative demands of these contexts on these processes, and spell out the neural bases of adaptive changes” (Green & Abutalebi, 2013, p. 516). In different interactional contexts, potentially competing linguistic representations generated across languages may emerge and require resolution at multiple levels and timepoints in the process of producing and understanding language. Control processes such as goal maintenance and interference control (i.e., conflict monitoring and interference suppression) are likely to be brought to bear in such situations, and in some situations other processes such as selective response inhibition and task engagement and disengagement might be required. A network of brain regions is proposed to implement these component processes, mainly during language production (Green & Abutalebi, 2013). These include bilateral inferior frontal gyrus, inferior parietal, insula, dorsal striatum, thalamus, right cerebellum, anterior cingulate cortex, and pre-supplementary motor area (pre-SMA; see Figure 1).

<Include Figure 1>

The expectation, from the perspective of the Adaptive Control model, is that *adaptive effects should be expressed in these regions that mediate control demands in bilingual contexts where these specific demands are high.*

A complementary neural model that has also been proposed is the bilingual anterior-to-posterior and subcortical shift (BAPSS; Grundy et al., 2017). The central tenet of this model is that, for nonverbal executive tasks, “bilingualism is associated

with a model of efficient brain recruitment” in the form of less recruitment of “frontal and executive regions” and greater recruitment of “posterior/subcortical regions” (p. 190). However, other than naming the dorsolateral prefrontal cortices and anterior cingulate cortices, the model is rather vague on what are the “basal ganglia and posterior regions.” In contrast to the Adaptive Control Model, which does specify a number of specific regional expectations, the BAPSS model is vague enough to the point where a number of findings can still fit within the model. As such, it does provide a framework for investigation, but further refinement of the specific regions proposed to be affected by bilingual experience would improve its usefulness.

Several (f)MRI studies have observed monolingual-bilingual differences in the regions described in these models (with some of these studies published before and forming the basis of these models). Studies focusing on cortical thickness or regional volume have reported differences between monolinguals and bilinguals at the whole-brain level (Mechelli et al., 2004; Ressel et al., 2012; Zou et al., 2012, Grogan et al., 2012; Pliatsikas et al., 2014; Klein et al., 2014), and some report the difference in brain regions associated with language control/executive control in e.g., the Adaptive Control Hypothesis (e.g., left inferior parietal lobule, in Mechelli et al., 2004; also see Abutalebi et al., 2015; left caudate nucleus in Zou et al., 2012; Klein et al., 2014). Region-of-interest based investigations more reliably find differences in such regions (Abutalebi et al., 2015), and in others (e.g., auditory cortex; Ressel et al., 2012), although several studies also report no reliable differences between monolingual and bilingual groups when the groups are examined at the whole-brain level (Ressel et al., 2012; Gold et al., 2013; Grogan et al., 2012).

Similar studies examining differences in white matter diffusion properties, whether in white matter regions or in specifically defined fibre pathways, have also

been reported. Such findings are, in some ways, even more difficult to interpret than regional morphometric differences with respect to how they relate to bilingual executive function advantages. This is because the nature of structural connections in white matter is difficult to ascribe to singular functions. First, although there is an emerging consensus regarding which fibre pathways comprise a “language connectome” (Dick, Bernal, & Tremblay, 2014), there is not a one-to-one mapping between function and pathway, and some pathways are associated with both language and executive function (Dick et al., 2019). Second, the white matter of the cortex is overwhelmingly populated with “crossing-fibres” from multiple dissociable projections. Thus, regional differences in white matter may indicate structural differences in multiple crossing fibre pathways, or at least it may be difficult to ascertain which pathway is contributing to the differences. Interpretation of group differences in white matter are therefore a cautious exercise.

Considered alongside these important caveats, there are several findings of note in the literature looking at structural differences (cf. Garcia-Penton et al., 2016, for review). It is encouraging to note that reliable differences are found in white matter and fibre pathways associated with processing language in monolingual populations (e.g., inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus (IFOF), inferior longitudinal fasciculus (ILF), uncinate fasciculus (UF), and superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF); Gold et al., 2013; Mohades et al., 2012; 2015; Pliatsikas et al., 2015; Cummine & Boliek, 2013; Luk et al., 2011). But although at first pass these differences seem encouraging, it is problematic that in some cases the same metric under study (e.g., fractional anisotropy measuring directional diffusion of water in white matter) is higher in the bilingual group, and in other cases the metric is higher in the monolingual group. Sometimes these contradictory effects occur in the same fibre

pathways. For example, Gold et al. (2013) show increased white matter in the IFOF for monolinguals while Luk et al. (2011) show a decrease. Thus, as in the morphologic and ERP literature, inconsistency overwhelms a clear and concise neurobiological story. Some methodological issues explaining such contradictions are likely to be unique to research on bilingual populations (e.g., the definition of bilingualism, or the age-group under study). Others may be specific to research using diffusion-weighted imaging (e.g., the post-processing pipeline, or the acquisition parameters of the scan), or to both (e.g., age is a methodological confound for both bilingual research and diffusion-weighted imaging). However, at present the research on structural differences offers an ambiguous and inconsistent story about the neurobiology of bilingualism more generally (García-Pentón et al., 2016), and does not strongly and reliably overlap with expectations from neurocognitive models of the bilingual advantage for executive function.

fMRI studies have been used to examine whether activation dynamics in brain regions associated with executive function during non-language tasks are different across bilingual and monolingual groups. In an often-cited and focused review, Pliatsikas and Luk (2016) examined a corpus of such studies and concluded, based on this evidence, that bilingual experience has consequences for brain activity in domain-general executive control regions beyond language processing. In some cases, the reviewed studies indeed report bilingual-monolingual differences in areas associated with executive control, including the right caudate nucleus (Mohades et al., 2014); anterior cingulate cortex (Garbin et al., 2010; Mohades et al., 2014); left parietal lobule (Ansaldi et al., 2015, although no direct comparison between groups was provided; Luk et al., 2010). In addition, studies have identified differences in bilinguals and monolinguals in many other regions (e.g., in the bilateral cerebellum,

bilateral superior temporal gyri, left supramarginal gyrus, bilateral postcentral gyri, and bilateral precuneus; Luk et al., 2010) that would not have been predicted by either the Adaptive Control model or the BAPPS model. It is not always clear, therefore, how differences between bilinguals and monolinguals reflect the functioning of brain networks involved in domain-general executive function. Furthermore, and similar to ERP studies, it is sometimes unclear whether an increase or decrease in these regions would reflect more efficient processing in bilinguals, and sometimes both directions have been observed (cf., Garbin et al., 2010 versus Mohades et al., 2014).

5.2.2. fMRI and behavioural data

The interpretation of the direction of activation differences becomes even more difficult when the findings are either not accompanied by behavioural differences, or when they are accompanied by a behavioural disadvantage for the bilingual group. For example, Mohades and colleagues (2014) scanned two groups of bilingual children and a group of monolingual children while they performed a Simon task, and a Stroop task, in the MRI scanner. In prior behavioural studies, bilingual children show smaller switch costs and faster reaction times on these tasks (Bialystok et al., 2004; Coderre & van Heuven, 2014). But in the study by Mohades and colleagues, the two bilingual groups actually showed significantly *worse* performance than the monolingual participants. Furthermore, the brain differences were not related directly to behavioural performance. This, coupled with the fact that the bilingual children actually performed worse on the tasks based on behavioural measurements, calls into question the degree to which this study provides neuroimaging support for a bilingual executive function advantage in Simon and Stroop tasks. This study is cited as evidence in favor of the BAPSS model because it shows that children *over-recruit*

regions that are later engaged more efficiently by bilingual adults (Grundy et al., 2017). But given the performance difference, with bilinguals performing more poorly, it is difficult to fit this study within a model trying to explain bilingual *advantages* in executive function. This is a good illustration of the problem of an under-specified neurobiological theory, because essentially all findings fit the model.

Other studies find brain differences without behavioural differences (e.g., Ansaldi et al., 2015; Luk et al., 2010). Despite the absence of behavioural differences, the latter study by Luk et al. is cited to support the conclusion that “response inhibition and response selection are distinguishable but related processes; and the recruitment of the more distributed network for response selection by bilinguals suggests that they can rely on this network for interference suppression more successfully than monolinguals” (Pliatsikas and Luk, 2016, p. 700). The lack of a significant group difference might be due to the small sample size ($n = 10$), but regardless the lack of a behavioural difference makes the neuroimaging data difficult to interpret. Unlike some studies reviewed above, the authors did examine the association between behavioural performance and brain activation. But again, there was no statistically significant relationship identified. Despite this, the authors reported that the pattern of brain-behaviour associations was different between the groups.

Similar problems plague other studies, even those conducted more recently. For example, a more recent study by DeLuca and colleagues (2020) using the flanker paradigm in an fMRI study of bilinguals also found no behavioural difference—that is, measures of bilingual language experience did not modulate behavioural performance on the task. In other studies using task-switching paradigms, group differences in response time were not statistically reliable, or direct comparison of

activation differences were not statistically reliable across the groups, or both (Garbin et al., 2010; Rodriguez-Pujades et al., 2013). An exception to this is the study by Gold et al., (2013), which did report a bilingual advantage for task switching, although this only occurred for an older bilingual group, but not for a younger bilingual group tested on the same task. Activation differences were found in left middle and inferior frontal gyrus, and anterior cingulate cortical regions predicted by the Adaptive Control model, but only for the older group. In terms of its overlap with the regions proposed by the Adaptive Control Model, this might provide the strongest combination of behavioural and brain differences, but it still provides only partial support for the predictions of the model because the finding only occurs in the older group. Thus, there is simultaneously evidence for and against the model predictions.

5.2.3. Reverse inference

The link between behaviour and brain is arguably critical for understanding the source of potential cognitive benefits of bilingualism, but research groups differ in terms of how they view the utility of behavioural data. Some have suggested that the lack of behavioural differences is an advantage, and argue that “equivalent performance in the two groups allows meaningful interpretation of the differences in functional neural correlates without the possible confound of behavioral differences.” (Luk et al., 2010, p. 355). De Luca and colleagues (2020) suggest that neuroimaging data are more “granular” and by implication more sensitive and reliable, and Grundy and colleagues (2017) make a complementary argument, stating that, when investigating the bilingual advantage, matching behaviour allows brain differences to be discussed in the absence of a behavioural confound.

However, the opposite is arguably true. First, neuroimaging data tend to be *noisier* and *less* sensitive than behavioural data (e.g., ADHD-200 consortium, Brown et al., 2012). Second, and more importantly, we argue that the behavioural difference is not a confound, but rather it is a condition on which the study is predicated. A coherent model of how bilingual experience shapes the specialization of neural regions involved in domain general executive function should at a minimum be able to relate performance differences to regional activity proposed to be involved in the executive function processes of interest. In fact, any model claiming a behavioural advantage for executive function in bilinguals should be able to show evidence of such an advantage in the sample under investigation. As an analogy, a pharmaceutical company would not be providing convincing evidence of a new performance enhancing drug if they failed to show that it enhances performance, , even if they could reliably show differences in activation patterns in brain circuitry between treated and non-treated participants.

In summary, although the conclusion of some research groups (e.g., Pliatsikas and Luk, 2016; Grundy et al., 2017; DeLuca et al., 2020) is that bilingual experience has consequences for neural processing during executive control tasks, the evidence is inconsistent, not always supported by behavioural differences or correlations with behavioural patterns, and suffers from critical threats to internal validity. One of the biggest threats to internal validity, which applies to both the fMRI and the structural imaging findings, is the strong reliance on what Poldrack (2006) called “reverse inference”. Put simply, this is the process of reasoning backwards from the presence of some brain activation or structural difference to the engagement of or difference in a particular cognitive function.

Why is reverse inference reasoning a threat to internal validity? At a definitional level, internal validity is about causal inferences, or more specifically that any observed covariation between A and B reflects a causal relationship (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Because it is a characteristic of a knowledge claim (Shadish, 1995), it is not inherent to research design, but the degree to which a claim has high internal validity is tightly bound to research design. Thus, to support valid inference of causality, the research design must maximize three tenets of internal validity: 1) A must precede B in time; 2) A must covary with B (which is implied), and 3) no other explanations for the relationship are plausible.

When reverse inference reasoning is employed, it is often done without regard to design, and in most cases, it violates at least two of the tenets described above, and sometimes all three. Further, as Poldrack (2006) notes, fundamentally, reverse inference is a deductively invalid line of argument (i.e., it is akin to the logical fallacy of affirmation of the consequent²). It begins with the assumption of a one-to-one mapping between brain activity/activity differences and a specific behaviour, taking the argument form “If cognitive process A is engaged, then brain area B is active.” Then it applies the logical fallacy “If brain area B is active, cognitive process A is engaged” (i.e., affirmation of the consequent). If the association between A and B were exclusive, this would not necessarily be invalid. That is, when B occurs IF AND ONLY IF A occurs, there is the establishment of temporal precedence and covariance, and a mitigation of alternative explanations for the association. But for brain imaging data, this is rarely, if ever, the case. Even in primary cortical areas, exclusivity is not established (e.g., activity in primary visual cortex does not imply the person is seeing

² Affirmation of the consequent is a formal logical fallacy. It takes the form “IF P, THEN Q. Q, THEREFORE P.” For example, “IF an animal is a cat, THEN it has a tail. My dog has a tail, THEREFORE it is a cat.”

anything physically in the environment because visual cortex can show activity during visual hallucinations in the absence of sensory input; Pajani et al., 2015). In regions associated with higher-order cognitive processes, selectivity of activation associated with a particular process is very difficult to establish (Poldrack, 2006).

Despite this shortcoming, in the set of neuroimaging studies we reviewed, the logic of reverse inference was predominant. Thus, when behavioural differences are not established, are in the opposite direction than what was expected (i.e., bilinguals perform worse), are not even examined, or if there is no tested or established association between brain and behaviour, there cannot be a valid statement about how fMRI or structural MRI data relate to cognitive benefits of bilingualism. At best, using this line of reasoning is useful as a statement of probability (Poldrack, 2006), but noting activation or structural differences in a region cannot, by itself and without a link to behaviour, provide strong evidence that a cognitive process is at work.

5.2.4. Individual differences in language experiences

Assessing whether there are structural or functional brain differences between bilinguals and monolinguals is an interesting question on its own. Indeed, there is a large amount of literature focusing on differences between bilinguals and monolinguals without making claims regarding behavioural consequences or “bilingual advantages”. Recent frameworks have been proposed to describe and understand how bilingualism might change brain structure and functions (e.g., Pliatsikas, 2019), including a focus on different types of language learners and bilinguals. Empirical work has started to examine how different bilingual experiences can shape brain structure and function. For example, DeLuca et al. (2019) studied how L2 age of acquisition, L2 length of immersion, L2 use at home, and L2 use in social settings related to brain structure and

connectivity. Their results showed relationships between the various language experiences examined and structure and connectivity measures, highlighting the importance of studying individual differences in future research. Other recent studies have also started to focus on individual differences between bilinguals in fMRI studies on executive control. (e.g., Claussenius-Kalman, Vaughn, Archila-Suerte, & Hernandez, 2020; DeLuca et al., 2020; Del Maschio et al., 2019; Gullifer et al., 2018). These studies will be of great use to further develop theories on neural changes in response to language learning and/or bilingualism (e.g., Pliatsikas, 2019). In line with similar developments in behavioural studies, these are very important and promising pathways. However, similar to behavioural research, we do not know enough about how individual differences modulate *language* control in the brain to formulate concise hypotheses about how these individual differences might modulate the neural correlates of executive control. Both behavioural and neuroimaging research on individual differences in *language* control is pivotal if we want to understand how bilingualism might modulate the structure and function of the brain in relation to non-linguistic control.

6. Moving forward

There is a clear and undisputable advantage that comes with bilingualism: being bilingual and being able to communicate and connect with more people. Bilingualism and bilingual education should therefore be promoted, regardless of the putative cognitive consequences. In this review we focused on key issues affecting behavioural and neuroimaging research on bilingualism and executive control: The need for falsifiable theories and the need for a better understanding of bilingual language control. The development of vague theoretical frameworks and loose interpretation of

behavioural data mean that existing theories are becoming more difficult to falsify. We are not arguing that changes in theoretical frameworks or hypotheses are problematic. To advance as a field, new data should stimulate the formulation of new hypotheses and theories need to be updated based on new findings. The increasing emphasis on individual bilingual experiences, moving away from comparisons between bilinguals and monolinguals as groups without clear definitions of their language profile, is also laudible. However, the research into bilingual *language* control and the relationship with individual bilingual experiences is still in its infancy. Understanding this relationship is crucial for the argument that language experiences might be related to executive control. Before we can form clear hypotheses, we first need to clarify the link between *language* control and *language* experiences. Until we know more about bilingualism, bilingual language control, and structural and functional networks related to bilingualism, theories and hypotheses will remain vague. This means theories can be supported regardless of their results and cannot be falsified. For both behavioural and neuroimaging research on this topic to develop and improve, more precise theories on bilingual experiences and language control (as well as the relationship with cognitive control) are needed.

To move forward, especially with a focus on individual differences between bilinguals, we need more multi-lab collaborations in which researchers *a priori* agree on (and pre-register) the type of participants, measures of interest, data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation. Such a priori agreement will help with the development of clear, testable hypotheses and can help to overcome the multiple interpretations that are possible when e.g., different tasks show different findings. Such a collaboration across research groups will allow for a more unbiased interpretation of data, which in turn can help to formulate clearer theories. Moreover, multi-lab

collaborations are especially important if we want to compare different types of bilingualism. To directly compare different bilinguals and the role of individual experiences, access is needed to multiple bilingual populations who complete the exact same study and are analysed in exactly the same way.

It is not a solution to just keep adding data. For the research field to progress, we need to take a step back. We need to study the cognitive and neural mechanisms underlying language control. This knowledge can then be used to formulate clearer theories and hypotheses, which in turn need to be tested in collaborations across research groups.

Acknowledgement

The first author received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number 743691. The last author received funding from the Basque Government (BERC 2018–2021), the Agencia Estatal de Investigación: the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres/Units of Excellence (SEV - 2015 - 490) and grant (grant RTI2018-093547-B-I00).

References

- Abutalebi, J., Canini, M., Della Rosa, P. A., Green, D. W., & Weekes, B. S. (2015). The neuroprotective effects of bilingualism upon the inferior parietal lobule: a structural neuroimaging study in aging Chinese bilinguals. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 33, 3-13.
- Abutalebi, J., & Green, D. (2007). Bilingual language production: The neurocognition of language representation and control. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 20(3), 242-275.
- Ansaldo, A. I., Ghazi-Saidi, L., & Adrover-Roig, D. (2015). Interference control in elderly bilinguals: Appearances can be misleading. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 37(5), 455-470.
- Antón, E., Carreiras, M., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2019). The impact of bilingualism on executive functions and working memory in young adults. *PloS one*, 14(2), e0206770.
- Antón, E., Duñabeitia, J. A., Estévez, A., Hernández, J. A., Castillo, A., Fuentes, L. J., ... & Carreiras, M. (2014). Is there a bilingual advantage in the ANT task? Evidence from children. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 398.
- Antón, E., García, Y. F., Carreiras, M., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2016). Does bilingualism shape inhibitory control in the elderly?. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 90, 147-160.
- Antoniou, M. (2019). The advantages of bilingualism debate. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 5, 395-415.
- Beatty-Martínez, A. L., & Dussias, P. E. (2017). Bilingual experience shapes language processing: Evidence from codeswitching. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 95, 173-189.

- Bialystok, E. (2017). The bilingual adaptation: How minds accommodate experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(3), 233-262
- Bialystok, E., Abutalebi, J., Bak, T. H., Burke, D. M., & Kroll, J. F. (2016). Aging in two languages: Implications for public health. *Ageing Research Reviews*, 27, 56-60.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology and Aging*, 19(2), 290-303.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(4), 240–250.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F., & Luk, G. (2008). Cognitive control and lexical access in younger and older bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 34(4), 859.
- Bialystok, E., & Martin, M. M. (2004). Attention and inhibition in bilingual children: Evidence from the dimensional change card sort task. *Developmental Science*, 7(3), 325-339.
- Bice, K., & Kroll, J. F. (2019). English only? Monolinguals in linguistically diverse contexts have an edge in language learning. *Brain and Language*, 196, 104644.
- Blanco-Elorrieta, E., & Pylkkänen, L. (2017). Bilingual Language Switching in the Laboratory versus in the Wild: The Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Adaptive Language Control. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 37(37), 9022-9036.
- Blanco-Elorrieta, E., & Pylkkänen, L. (2018). Ecological validity in bilingualism research and the bilingual advantage. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(12), 1117-1126.
- Blumenfeld, H. K., & Marian, V. (2014). Cognitive control in bilinguals: Advantages

- in Stimulus–Stimulus inhibition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(3), 610-629.
- Brown, M. R., Sidhu, G. S., Greiner, R., Asgarian, N., Bastani, M., Silverstone, P. H., ... & Dursun, S. M. (2012). ADHD-200 Global Competition: diagnosing ADHD using personal characteristic data can outperform resting state fMRI measurements. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 6, 69.
- Cespón, J., & Carreiras, M. (2020) Is there electrophysiological evidence for a bilingual advantage in neural processes related to executive functions? *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 118, 315-330.
- Claussenius- Kalman, H., Vaughn, K. A., Archila- Suerte, P., & Hernandez, A. E. (2020). Age of acquisition impacts the brain differently depending on neuroanatomical metric. *Human Brain Mapping*, 41(2), 484-502.
- Coderre, E. L., & van Heuven, W. J. (2014). Electrophysiological explorations of the bilingual advantage: Evidence from a Stroop task. *PLoS One*, 9(7), e103424.
- Comishen, K. J., Bialystok, E., & Adler, S. A. (2019). The impact of bilingual environments on selective attention in infancy, *Developmental Science*, 1–11.
- Costa, A., Hernández, M., Costa-Faidella, J., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2009). On the bilingual advantage in conflict processing: Now you see it, now you don't. *Cognition*, 113(2), 135-149.
- Costa, A., Hernández, M., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2008). Bilingualism aids conflict resolution: Evidence from the ANT task. *Cognition*, 106(1), 59-86.
- Costa, A., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2014). How does the bilingual experience sculpt the brain? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 15, 336–345
- Cummine, J., & Boliek, C. A. (2013). Understanding white matter integrity stability for

- bilinguals on language status and reading performance. *Brain Structure and Function*, 218(2), 595-601.
- De Baene, W., Duyck, W., Brass, M., & Carreiras, M. (2015). Brain circuit for cognitive control is shared by task and language switching. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 27(9), 1752-1765.
- De Bruin, A. (2019). Not all bilinguals are the same: A call for more detailed assessments and descriptions of bilingual experiences. *Behavioral Sciences*, 9(3), 33.
- De Bruin, A., Samuel, A.G., & Duñabeitia, J.A. (2018). Voluntary language switching: When and why do bilinguals switch between their languages? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 103, 28-43.
- DeLuca, V., Rothman, J., Bialystok, E., & Pliatsikas, C. (2019). Redefining bilingualism as a spectrum of experiences that differentially affects brain structure and function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(15), 7565-7574.
- DeLuca, V., Rothman, J., Bialystok, E., & Pliatsikas, C. (2020). Duration and extent of bilingual experience modulate neurocognitive outcomes. *NeuroImage*, 204, 116222.
- Del Maschio, N., Sulpizio, S., Toti, M., Caprioglio, C., Del Mauro, G., Fedeli, D., & Abutalebi, J. (2019). Second language use rather than second language knowledge relates to changes in white matter microstructure. *Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science*, 1-11.
- Dick, A. S., Bernal, B., & Tremblay, P. (2014). The language connectome: new pathways, new concepts. *The Neuroscientist*, 20(5), 453-467.
- Dick, A. S., Garic, D., Graziano, P., & Tremblay, P. (2019). The frontal aslant tract

- (FAT) and its role in speech, language and executive function. *Cortex*, *111*, 148-163.
- Dick, A. S., Garcia, N. L., Pruden, S. M., Thompson, W. K., Hawes, S. W., Sutherland, M. T., Riedel, M. C., Laird, A. R., & Gonzalez, R. (2019). No bilingual advantage for executive function: Evidence from a large sample of children in the Adolescent Brain and Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. *Nature Human Behavior*, *3*(7), 692-701.
- Donnelly, S., Brooks, P. J., & Homer, B. D. (2019). Is there a bilingual advantage on interference-control tasks? A multiverse meta-analysis of global reaction time and interference cost. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1-26.
- Duñabeitia, J. A., & Carreiras, M. (2015). The bilingual advantage: acta est fabula. *Cortex*, *73*, 371-372.
- Duñabeitia, J. A., Hernández, J. A., Antón, E., Macizo, P., Estévez, A., Fuentes, L. J., & Carreiras, M. (2014). The inhibitory advantage in bilingual children revisited. *Experimental Psychology*, *61*(3), 234-251.
- Emmorey, K., Luk, G., Pyers, J. E., & Bialystok, E. (2008). The Source of Enhanced Cognitive Control in Bilinguals Evidence From Bimodal Bilinguals. *Psychological Science*, *19*(12), 1201-1206.
- Engel de Abreu, P. M. (2011). Working memory in multilingual children: Is there a bilingual effect?. *Memory*, *19*(5), 529-537.
- Friedman, N. P. (2016). Research on individual differences in executive functions: Implications for the bilingual advantage hypothesis. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *6*(5), 535-548.
- Garbin, G., Sanjuan, A., Forn, C., Bustamante, J. C., Rodríguez-Pujadas, A., Belloch,

- V., ... & Ávila, C. (2010). Bridging language and attention: Brain basis of the impact of bilingualism on cognitive control. *Neuroimage*, 53(4), 1272-1278.
- García-Pentón, L., Fernandez Garcia, Y., Costello, B., Duñabeitia, J. A., & Carreiras, M. (2016). The neuroanatomy of bilingualism: how to turn a hazy view into the full picture. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(3), 303-327.
- Gathercole, V. C. M., Thomas, E. M., Kennedy, I., Prys, C., Young, N., Viñas-Guasch, N., ... & Jones, L. (2014). Does language dominance affect cognitive performance in bilinguals? Lifespan evidence from preschoolers through older adults on card sorting, Simon, and metalinguistic tasks. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 11.
- Gold, B. T., Johnson, N. F., & Powell, D. K. (2013). Lifelong bilingualism contributes to cognitive reserve against white matter integrity declines in aging. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(13), 2841-2846.
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 67-81.
- Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2013). Language control in bilinguals: The adaptive control hypothesis. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 515-530.
- Grogan, A., Jones, Ō. P., Ali, N., Crinion, J., Orabona, S., Mechias, M. L., ... & Price, C. J. (2012). Structural correlates for lexical efficiency and number of languages in non-native speakers of English. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(7), 1347-1352.
- Grundy, J. G. (2020). The effects of bilingualism on executive functions: an updated quantitative analysis. *Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science*, 1-23.
- Grundy, J. G., Anderson, J. A., & Bialystok, E. (2017). Neural correlates of cognitive processing in monolinguals and bilinguals. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1396(1), 183-201.

- Gullifer, J. W., Chai, X. J., Whitford, V., Pivneva, I., Baum, S., Klein, D., & Titone, D. (2018). Bilingual experience and resting-state brain connectivity: Impacts of L2 age of acquisition and social diversity of language use on control networks. *Neuropsychologia*, 117, 123-134.
- Gunnerud, H. L., Ten Braak, D., Reikerås, E. K. L., Donolato, E., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2020). Is bilingualism related to a cognitive advantage in children? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*.
- Hagoort, P. (2019). The neurobiology of language beyond single-word processing. *Science*, 366(6461), 55-58.
- Hartsuiker, R. J. (2015). Why it is pointless to ask under which specific circumstances the bilingual advantage occurs. *Cortex*, 73, 336-337.
- Hilchey, M. D., Saint-Aubin, J. & Klein, R. M. (2015). Does bilingual exercise enhance cognitive fitness in traditional non-linguistic executive processing tasks? In J. Schwieter (Ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingual Processing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalashnikova, M., Pejovic, J., & Carreiras, M. (in press) The Effects of Bilingualism on Attentional Processes in the First Year of Life.
- Kirk, N. W., Kempe, V., Scott-Brown, K. C., Philipp, A., & Declerck, M. (2018). Can monolinguals be like bilinguals? Evidence from dialect switching. *Cognition*, 170, 164-178.
- Klein, D., Mok, K., Chen, J. K., & Watkins, K. E. (2014). Age of language learning shapes brain structure: a cortical thickness study of bilingual and monolingual individuals. *Brain and Language*, 131, 20-24.
- Kovács, A. M., & Mehler, J. (2009). Cognitive gains in 7-month-old bilingual infants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(16), 6556–6560.

- Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 497-514.
- Laine, M., & Lehtonen, M. (2018). Cognitive consequences of bilingualism: where to go from here?. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(9), 1205-1212.
- Lehtonen, M., Soveri, A., Laine, A., Järvenpää, J., de Bruin, A., & Antfolk, J. (2018). Is bilingualism associated with enhanced executive functioning in adults? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(4), 394-425
- Luk, G., Anderson, J. A., Craik, F. I., Grady, C., & Bialystok, E. (2010). Distinct neural correlates for two types of inhibition in bilinguals: Response inhibition versus interference suppression. *Brain and Cognition*, 74(3), 347-357.
- Luk, G., Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., & Grady, C. L. (2011). Lifelong bilingualism maintains white matter integrity in older adults. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(46), 16808-16813.
- Luk, G., De Sa, E. R. I. C., & Bialystok, E. (2011). Is there a relation between onset age of bilingualism and enhancement of cognitive control?. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 14(4), 588-595.
- Mechelli, A., Crinion, J. T., Noppeney, U., O'Doherty, J., Ashburner, J., Frackowiak, R. S., & Price, C. J. (2004). Structural plasticity in the bilingual brain. *Nature*, 431(7010), 757-757.
- Mohades, S. G., Struys, E., Van Schuerbeek, P., Mondt, K., Van De Craen, P., & Luypaert, R. (2012). DTI reveals structural differences in white matter tracts between bilingual and monolingual children. *Brain Research*, 1435, 72-80.
- Mohades, S. G., Struys, E., Van Schuerbeek, P., Baeken, C., Van De Craen, P., &

- Luypaert, R. (2014). Age of second language acquisition affects nonverbal conflict processing in children: an fMRI study. *Brain and Behavior*, 4(5), 626-642.
- Mohades, S. G., Van Schuerbeek, P., Rosseel, Y., Van De Craen, P., Luypaert, R., & Baeken, C. (2015). White-matter development is different in bilingual and monolingual children: a longitudinal DTI study. *PloS one*, 10(2), e0117968.
- Nichols, E. S., Wild, C. J., Stojanoski, B., Battista, M. E., & Owen, A. M. (2020). Bilingualism affords no general cognitive advantages: A population study of executive function in 11,000 People. *Psychological Science*, 31(5), 548-567.
- Pajani, A., Kok, P., Kouider, S., & de Lange, F. P. (2015). Spontaneous activity patterns in primary visual cortex predispose to visual hallucinations. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(37), 12947-12953.
- Paap, K. (2019). The bilingual advantage debate: quantity and quality of the evidence. In J. W. Schwieter (Ed.), *The Handbook of the Neuroscience of Multilingualism* (701-735). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Paap, K. R., Anders-Jefferson, R., Mikulinsky, R., Masuda, S., & Mason, L. (2019). On the encapsulation of bilingual language control. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 105, 76-92.
- Paap, K. R., & Greenberg, Z. I. (2013). There is no coherent evidence for a bilingual advantage in executive processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, 66(2), 232-258.
- Paap, K. R., Johnson, H. A., & Sawi, O. (2015). Bilingual advantages in executive functioning either do not exist or are restricted to very specific and undetermined circumstances. *Cortex*, 69, 265-278.
- Paap, K. R., Myuz, H. A., Anders, R. T., Bockelman, M. F., Mikulinsky, R., & Sawi,

- O. M. (2017). No compelling evidence for a bilingual advantage in switching or that frequent language switching reduces switch cost. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 29(2), 89-112.
- Pelham, S. D., & Abrams, L. (2014). Cognitive advantages and disadvantages in early and late bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40(2), 313-325.
- Perani, D., Farsad, M., Ballarini, T., Lubian, F., Malpetti, M., Fracchetti, A., ... & Abutalebi, J. (2017). The impact of bilingualism on brain reserve and metabolic connectivity in Alzheimer's dementia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(7), 1690-1695.
- Pliatsikas, C. (2019). Understanding structural plasticity in the bilingual brain: The Dynamic Restructuring Model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1-13.
- Pliatsikas, C., Johnstone, T., & Marinis, T. (2014). Grey matter volume in the cerebellum is related to the processing of grammatical rules in a second language: a structural voxel-based morphometry study. *The Cerebellum*, 13(1), 55-63.
- Pliatsikas, C., & Luk, G. (2016). Executive control in bilinguals: A concise review on fMRI studies. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(4), 699-705.
- Pliatsikas, C., Moschopoulou, E., & Saddy, J. D. (2015). The effects of bilingualism on the white matter structure of the brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(5), 1334-1337.
- Poldrack, R. A. (2006). Can cognitive processes be inferred from neuroimaging data?. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(2), 59-63.
- Prior, A., & Gollan, T. H. (2011). Good language-switchers are good task-

- switchers: Evidence from Spanish–English and Mandarin–English bilinguals. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 17(4), 682-691.
- Ressel, V., Pallier, C., Ventura-Campos, N., Díaz, B., Roessler, A., Ávila, C., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2012). An effect of bilingualism on the auditory cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(47), 16597-16601.
- Rey-Mermet, A., Gade, M., & Oberauer, K. (2018). Should we stop thinking about inhibition? Searching for individual and age differences in inhibition ability. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 44(4), 501.
- Rodríguez-Pujadas, A., Sanjuán, A., Ventura-Campos, N., Román, P., Martín, C., Barceló, F., ... & Ávila, C. (2013). Bilinguals use language-control brain areas more than monolinguals to perform non-linguistic switching tasks. *PLoS One*, 8(9), e73028.
- Rouder, J., Kumar, A., & Haaf, J. M. (2019, March 25). Why Most Studies of Individual Differences With Inhibition Tasks Are Bound To Fail. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/3cjr5>
- Shadish, W. R. (1995). The logic of generalization: Five principles common to experiments and ethnographies. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 419-428.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Singh, N., & Mishra, R. K. (2013). Second language proficiency modulates conflict-monitoring in an oculomotor Stroop task: evidence from Hindi-English bilinguals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 322.

- Surrain, S. H., & Luk, G. (2019). Describing bilinguals: A systematic review of labels and descriptions used in the literature between 2005–2015. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 22(2), 401-415.
- van den Noort, M., Struys, E., Bosch, P., 2019. Individual variation and the bilingual advantage-factors that modulate the effect of bilingualism on cognitive control and cognitive reserve. *Behavioral Science*, 9(12).
- Verreyt, N., Woumans, E., Vandelandotte, D., Szmalec, A., & Duyck, W. (2016). The influence of language-switching experience on the bilingual executive control advantage. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(01), 181-190.
- Vinerte, S., & Sabourin, L. (2019). Reviewing the bilingual cognitive control literature: Can a brain-based approach resolve the debate?. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Experimentale*, 73(2), 118-134.
- Woumans, E., Ceuleers, E., Van der Linden, L., Szmalec, A., & Duyck, W. (2015). Verbal and nonverbal cognitive control in bilinguals and interpreters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 41(5), 1579-1586.
- Zou, L., Ding, G., Abutalebi, J., Shu, H., & Peng, D. (2012). Structural plasticity of the left caudate in bimodal bilinguals. *Cortex*, 48(9), 1197-1206.




Figure 1. Brain regions comprising the Adaptive Control Model, based on Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2013). Language control in bilinguals: The adaptive control hypothesis. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 515-530. Cortical and subcortical brain regions are proposed to be involved in language control and language switching, and in implementing various control processes proposed by the Adaptive Control Model. LH = Left Hemisphere. RH = Right Hemisphere.

Please sign two copies, retain one for your files and return the other to the editorial office.

Publication Agreement

Agreement: We are pleased to have the privilege of publishing your Article in a forthcoming issue of *Neurobiology of Language*, an open access journal. By your signature below, you hereby grant all your right, title, and interest in the Article to the Society for the Neurobiology of Language (SNL) and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). By assigning copyright for your work to MIT, The MIT Press will be able to fully disseminate your work while protecting it from inappropriate use.

Open Access Publication of your Article: Your Article will be published under the Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license in *Neurobiology of Language*: <https://www.mitpressjournals.org/loi/nol>. For more information regarding this license, please see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Rights Reserved by Author: You hereby retain and reserve for yourself a non-exclusive license: 1.) to photocopy the Article for use in your own teaching activities, 2.) to publish the Article, or permit it to be published, as a part of any book you may write, or in any anthology of which you are an editor, in which the Article is included or which expands or elaborates on the Article, 3.) to self-archive the Article on your website and institutional repositories in accordance with the CC BY license described at the guidelines found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. As a condition of reserving this right, you agree that The MIT Press and *Neurobiology of Language* will be given first publication credit, and proper copyright notice will be displayed on the work (both on the work as a whole and, where applicable, on the Article as well) whenever such publication occurs.

Rights of The MIT Press: The MIT Press is responsible for the dissemination of *Neurobiology of Language* and its contents in various ways. In addition to dissemination via a CC BY license, The MIT Press, the Publisher of *Neurobiology of Language*, will have the following rights among others: 1.) to license abstracts, quotations, extracts, reprints, and/or translations of the work for publication 2.) to license reprints of the Article to third persons for educational photocopying 3.) to license others to create abstracts of the Article 4.) to license secondary publishers to reproduce the Article in print, microform, or any computer readable form including electronic on-line databases. This also includes licensing the Article for document delivery.

Warranties: You warrant that the Article's text has not been published before in any form, that you have made no license or other transfer to anyone with respect to your copyright in it, that you are its sole author(s), and generally that you have the right to make the grants you make to us. Any exceptions are to be noted below. You also warrant that the Article does not libel anyone, invade anyone's privacy, infringe anyone's copyright, or otherwise violate any statutory or common law right of anyone. You agree to indemnify us against any claim or action alleging facts which, if true, constitute a breach of any of the foregoing warranties.

3rd Party Copyrighted Content: If your article contains third party copyrighted material (images, illustrations, etc.) that you do not own copyright to, please check this box ☐ to confirm that you have obtained and submitted a copy of the required releases for republication under a CC BY license. You must include proper copyright notice as required by the original copyright holder. Unless you have provided copyright notice or a credit line that attributes the content to another copyright holder, the terms of this agreement will govern that content as well.

Supplementary Material Agreement: If you are submitting supplementary material, check here ☐ and return initialed page 2.

Multiple Authors: If there is more than one author of the Article, the word "you" includes all authors jointly and severally. The corresponding author may sign on behalf of all authors if he or she has the authority to act as their agent. Please check off the "for all authors" box if it is applicable.

Concerning Promotional Material: If you wish to give *Neurobiology of Language* permission to use your illustrations in promotional materials for the journal, please check off this space ☐. In the event that one of your illustrations is used for this purpose, you and the artwork will be appropriately credited.

Concerning U.S. (Federal) Government Employees: Some of the foregoing grants and warranties will not apply if the Article was written by U.S. Government employees acting within the scope of their employment. If you are a U.S. Government employee who prepared this work as part of your official duties and there is no copyright to transfer, please check this box ☐.

Electronic signature: You agree that this agreement may be signed with an electronic signature, that an electronic signature shall be valid and binding for all purposes, and hereby waive any objection to use of an electronic version of this agreement as a substitute for the original for any legally recognized purpose.

In Conclusion: This is the entire agreement between you and us, and it may be modified only in writing. It will bind and benefit our respective successors in interest. It will terminate if we do not publish your Article within two years of the date of your signature(s).

I (we) concur in this letter of agreement: **MC** for all authors]

The MIT Press hereby acknowledge their consent to the terms of the foregoing agreement.

Manuel Carreiras Spanish

Print Name

Citizenship



March 4th, 2021

Signature

Date

Nick Lindsay, Journals Director, The MIT Press

Clear theories are needed to interpret differences

Article Title

Manuscript #